



the profile in Ellis for that particular television equipment is the same regardless of the actual user. For example, if a parent uses the television in the children's room the profile for that television is the same as if the children were using that television. The profiles/settings in this particular example are related to the television in the children's room, not a profile for the children themselves. In other words, the profiles/settings are equipment-specific, not user-specific. Accordingly, these profiles/settings are not user objects as recited in the claims because the profiles/settings are not associated with a respective user of the access devices/client systems.

Furthermore, there is no teaching in Ellis of multiple user objects. Ellis does disclose that program guide settings can be shared with another device using a user password (Ellis, [0094]), but there is no indication that there is more than one such user password per household.

Therefore, Ellis does not teach or suggest every element of the claims. For at least these reasons, claims 1, 11, 15, 20, 31, 34, 36, 38, and 39, as well as the remainder of the claims which depend therefrom, are patentable over Ellis. The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.

Claims 24 and 36 refer to a bit vector where the bit vector has a plurality of bits each being associated to a corresponding configuration parameter of the one of the user objects. The Office Action points to paragraph [0079] of Ellis as the basis for the rejection of this claim. The Applicant was unable to identify disclosure of the recited bit vector in this portion of Ellis. Paragraph [0079] is directed to receiving and displaying graphics and refers to a bitmap. However, a bitmap is simply a method of storing graphical information. The bitmap is not the recited bit vector and certainly does not contain bits that are associated to corresponding configuration parameters of the one of the user objects. The bitmap is unrelated to the user objects or to configuration parameters thereof. If this rejection of claims 24 and 36 is maintained the Applicant respectfully requests that the next Office Action explicitly indicate what item in Ellis corresponds to the recited bit vector. For at least these additional reasons, the Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 24 and 36.

Dated: February 12, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

{S:\20643\1205190-us4\80096851.DOC 1205190-us4\80096851.DOC}